

RULES, ENACTMENTS & INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE
Held In Room 318
PUTNAM COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
CARMEL, NEW YORK 10512

Members: Chairwoman Addonizio, Legislators Gouldman & Scuccimarra

Thursday September 17, 2015
(Immediately Following the Economic Development Meeting beginning at 6:30pm)

The meeting was called to order at 7:18 P.M. by Chairwoman Addonizio who requested Legislator Gouldman lead in the Pledge of Allegiance. Upon roll call, Legislators Gouldman & Scuccimarra and Chairwoman Addonizio were present.

Item #3 - Approval of Minutes – August 5, 2015

The minutes were approved as submitted.

Legislator Scuccimarra made a motion to waive the rules and accept the additional; Seconded by Chairwoman Addonizio. All in favor.

Item #4 - Approval/ Proposed Amendment/ Chapter 55 of the Putnam County Code Entitled “Ethics, Code of, and Financial Disclosure”

a) Subsection 55-2C Entitled “Definitions”

Chairman of the Ethics Board Bob Bickford stated the code presently requires annual financial disclosure statements from all County Officers and Employees defined to include any member of an advisory board. He stated the opinion of the Committee in the past was that it may be unfair to require this of volunteer members of advisory boards. He read subsection 55-2C of the Code of Putnam County, stating exemptions from filing annual disclosure statements in regards to members of advisory boards: *“A member of an advisory board of the County if, but only if, i) the advisory board has no authority to implement its recommendations or to act on behalf of the County or to restrict the authority of the County to act, and ii) such member is not entitled to participate in making recommendations regarding policy.”* He stated there is no point to an advisory board if the members are not giving advice on policy. He stated his proposal is to eliminate clause (ii) to make it clear that all members of advisory boards who are not otherwise subject to this rule would not have to file an annual financial disclosure statement.

Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

b) Subsection 55-7 Entitled “Annual Disclosure Statements”/ Add New Subsection 55-7F

Mr. Bickford stated currently, the financial disclosure statements request information pertaining to one’s spouse and minor children. He stated the amendment would remove this provision. He stated it also states that the annual financial disclosure statement must be submitted through the mail, however they are now acceptable electronically. He stated this will also be amended.

Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Gouldman. All in favor.

c) Correspondence/ Board of Ethics/ Monetary Civil Penalties Under the Code of Ethics/ FYI

Mr. Bickford stated each year there are people who fail to file and some who have not filed in a number of years. He stated the Board of Ethics recommended that the Legislature impose a monetary penalty for failure to file the annual financial disclosure statements.

Chairwoman Addonizio questioned if the monetary penalty would be for paid employees who fail to file.

Mr. Bickford stated it would be for all who are required to file; both paid employees and volunteers on policy boards.

Legislator Scuccimarra requested an example of a policy board.

Mr. Bickford stated the Plumbing Board and Electrical Board are both policy boards. He stated generally, employees do file their annual financial disclosure statement. He stated those who fail to file are typically board members.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated volunteers may feel uncomfortable filing the statement since they are not technically employees who receive a salary.

Mr. Bickford stated the board members are making policy and are therefore required to file.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated it may be difficult to get people to volunteer if they are subjected to file the annual financial disclosure statement.

Legislator LoBue stated the annual financial disclosure statement is required so any conflict of interest may be identified. She suggested that any member who does not comply should be subject to removal from their respective board. She stated it is difficult and costly to impose a monetary fine. She stated the people serving on the

boards want to be in their position and if they want to remain in that capacity, they must comply. She stated it is unfair to those who do file.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated filing the forms for the purpose of identifying any conflict of interest makes sense. She questioned if there is a monetary fine.

Mr. Bickford stated the statute provides for a monetary penalty or removal from the board.

Legislator Scuccimarra agreed with Legislator LoBue that removal from the board is a better option.

Legislator Albano also agreed that removal from the board is the better option.

Mr. Bickford stated the Board of Ethics would agree as well. He recommended leaving the monetary penalty in place, as it is the Legislature's decision which penalty to enforce. He stated there may be a time when the Legislature decides that the monetary penalty is appropriate.

Legislator Nacerino suggested upon appointment, having the member sign off on an understanding that this financial disclosure statement will be required annually. She stated some boards have requirements for its members, such as residency or a title, and removal from the board could jeopardize the integrity as they may lose one of their requirements.

Mr. Bickford stated that would be taken into consideration at the time.

Legislator Albano stated it could be taken care of over time. He stated the person could be told they have six (6) months to file and if they do not, the Legislature can decide what is best.

Legislator LoBue stated she believed six (6) months is too long of a period of time and would rather set it to three (3) months once the person is put on notice. She stated the people who volunteer want to be in their position on the board. She agreed with Legislator Nacerino that prior to appointment to a board; the member should be notified that this is required.

Mr. Bickford stated all boards are informing new members of the requirement to file their annual financial disclosure statement.

Item #5 - Discussion/ County License Fees for Plumbers & Contractors 65 Years and Older

Chairwoman Addonizio stated Mrs. Villanova, who originally requested this proposal, was unable to attend the meeting. She stated Mrs. Villanova's request was to waive the \$500 annual licensing fee for plumbers and electricians over the age of 65 and the \$250

licensing fee every two (2) years for home improvement contractors over the age of 65. She stated Deputy County Attorney Daniel Harvey looked into this matter.

Deputy County Attorney Harvey stated there must be uniformity with the licensing requirements. He stated waiving the fee for contractors over 65 years old would create a new class of people who would not be paying. He stated the County cannot create a new class of people without a rational basis. He stated this is an equal protection issue and each class of people must be treated in an equal manor.

Legislator Gouldman questioned if a rational basis could be based on financial need.

Deputy County Attorney Harvey stated proving financial need is difficult. He also stated one (1) of the requirements to obtain a license is financial security. He stated it would be best to have a uniform fee.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated she looked into Dutchess, Rockland, Westchester, Ulster, and Orange Counties and found that none of them have any type of license fee waiver based on age.

Chairman of the Putnam County Board of Electrical Examiners John Morrison stated the fees should not be waived. He stated the Electrical Board took a vote and they voted unanimously not to waive any licensing fees. He stated the cost of the licensing fee is not high.

Member of the Putnam County Board of Electrical Examiners Arthur Bolduc stated his concern that waiving the fee for those over the age of 65 would lead to possible abuse of the system.

Chairman of the Putnam County Home Improvement Board Christopher Cusanelli stated the Home Improvement Board also agreed that the fee should not be waived.

Director of Consumer Affairs Jean Noel stated the Chairman of the Plumbing & Mechanical Trades Board was unable to attend the Board meeting where this was discussed so the members decided not to put it to a vote without the Chairman present. She stated although no vote was taken, the consensus was the same; that the fee should not be waived. She stated there are many contractors who reside outside of the County, but license within the County and it would be unfair to treat them differently.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated everyone present seems to be in agreement. She stated she would like to send a letter to Mrs. Villanova updating her on this evening's discussion.

Item #6 - Discussion/ Proposing Local Law to Create Animal Cruelty Registry

Putnam County SPCA Chief Kenneth Ross stated after the last meeting, he contacted the Putnam County District Attorney's Office to review the draft Local Law. He stated

Assistant District Attorney Heather Abissi reviewed the Local Law and made minor changes to make it more specific to Putnam County, but overall believed it was enforceable. Chief Ross then handed the Committee the draft Local Law as reviewed and changed by Assistant District Attorney Abissi.

Legislator Gouldman questioned if Deputy County Attorney Anna Diaz was aware of this draft Local Law.

Deputy County Attorney Diaz stated she was not aware of it. She stated she did reach out to the District Attorney's office to find what types of animal cruelty cases were being prosecuted within Putnam County. She stated a response was received from Assistant District Attorney Chana Krauss with a spreadsheet dating from December 2013 to the present.

Chief Ross stated he received the draft Local Law back from the District Attorney's Office the day before the meeting.

Legislator Gouldman suggested having everyone involved come together so everyone is on the same page.

Chief Ross stated he attempted to contact the Law Department but did not hear back. He questioned why the crimes being prosecuted within Putnam County were important to the Local Law. He stated if they were to be included in the Local Law, then a crime that may not have been committed yet would be unaccounted for under the Law.

Deputy County Attorney Diaz stated the registry would be for those who have been convicted.

Chief Ross stated going forward, other crimes may be committed that were not committed in the period of December 2013 to the present.

Legislator Gouldman stated the Legislature always has the ability to amend the Local Law to add crimes that may be committed and were not included on the original Local Law.

Chief Ross stated any animal related crime that is a misdemeanor and above should be included in the Law now rather than having to go back and amend it.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated she would like to have a representative from the District Attorney's Office attend the November Rules meeting to contribute to this discussion.

Legislator Nacerino stated although a crime may not be on the radar right now, the Local Law can always be amended to include it in the future.

Chief Ross stated the Local Law should include as many crimes as possible to avoid the possibility of a crime being committed and not being covered in the Law. He stated

although the Law can be amended to include the crime, it would be difficult to make it retroactive.

Legislator LoBue questioned how the Law is written in Westchester.

Chief Ross stated the Law in Westchester includes a long list of crimes that would fall under it.

Deputy County Attorney Diaz stated the laws cited in the Local Law drafted by the County Attorney's Office mirror those in Westchester. She stated other Counties have added the entire Agricultural and Markets Law. She stated in her opinion, this is unnecessary to include in its entirety as some things included in it do not rise to the level that the Animal Cruelty Registry is attempting to stop.

Chief Ross stated if someone goes to court and is convicted of a misdemeanor animal offense, they should not own an animal. He stated under this law, that person will be unable to own an animal for ten (10) years. He stated usually, when someone is arrested for a misdemeanor, by the time it goes through court, it will be dropped down to something else. He stated it is difficult to have a misdemeanor charge stick. He stated it would be wise to make the Law more encompassing now so a person who commits a crime that may have been left off would be on the registry. He provided an example of a person who was arrested for the abuse of a dog and went to court and was told he could not have an animal for six (6) months. He stated as soon as the six (6) months passed, he purchased another dog which he ended up abandoning two (2) weeks later. He stated there is recidivism with individuals who commit these crimes. He reiterated that the Law should include as much as it can.

Legislator LoBue questioned how to prevent someone who is on the registry from going out of State to purchase an animal.

Chief Ross stated under this Law, once the person is arrested on an animal cruelty charge, they are unable to own an animal for ten (10) years. He stated if a person goes out of State to purchase an animal and comes back into the County with that animal, they can be arrested.

Legislator LoBue questioned how it would be known that the person purchased an animal. She questioned if the animal, specifically a dog, would need to be registered within the County.

Chief Ross stated generally, the dog would need to be licensed.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated people do not always license their dogs.

Chief Ross stated typically, the person's neighbor will call the SPCA when they notice an animal on the property.

Legislator Nacerino questioned what the issue was with detailing this Local Law. She stated she is in favor of making the Law detailed from the beginning, but restated that if the Legislature believes more should be added in the future, there is a process in place to make that possible.

Chairwoman Addonizio questioned what would happen in the case of a person who is convicted of abusing a dog and they also own chickens.

Chief Ross stated if someone abuses one (1) animal, that person is not permitted to have any animals. He stated in the past, people have been found guilty in court and the judge has decided as part of the person's punishment to have the person work in a shelter. He stated this has proven to be detrimental to the animals in the shelter as the person often seeks retribution on the other animals. He stated a crime against an animal usually runs much deeper into the mental aspect of the person. He stated once a person proves themselves capable of harming an animal, the next step is the capability to harm another human being.

Chairwoman Addonizio questioned if any action is taken if children are in the residence.

Chief Ross stated the PC SPCA makes many child endangerment arrests because if the space is not livable for an animal, it is not livable for a human. He stated the purpose of the registry is to have a grasp on this issue. He stated the stronger the law now, the more convicted abusers will be away from animals.

Legislator LoBue stated this Law must be done right and it must be enforceable.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated this will be discussed again at the November meeting.

Chief Ross questioned if the Committee would like him to do anything by the November Meeting.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated the Legislature will request that the draft Local Law given to the Committee by Chief Ross be reviewed by the Law Department.

Item #7 - Approval/ Worker's Compensation Claim

Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Gouldman. All in favor.

Item #8 - Approval/ Request for Proclamation/ October 18-24 2015 as "Freedom from Workplace Bullies Week"

Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to pre-file the necessary resolution; Seconded by Legislator Gouldman. All in favor.

Item #9 - Discussion/ Taxi & Limousine Commission

Putnam County Chambers of Commerce Bill Nulk stated in order for the County to regulate the taxi and limousine services, the County must get permission from the State. He stated in order to request for permission from the State, the Towns must authorize the request. He stated in February 2014 letters were sent to each Town and Municipality requesting that they send a letter to the Legislature authorizing the County to request permission from New York State to regulate the taxi and limousine services. He stated when he spoke to the Town Supervisors, they were interested in the County regulating the services. He stated no letters were received back from the Towns.

Legislator LoBue suggested having each Legislator send a letter to the Town or Village they represent requesting this authorization.

Mr. Nulk stated when this was requested in 2002, the request was vetoed by the Governor.

Legislator Scuccimarra questioned why the taxi and limousine commission is needed.

Mr. Nulk stated there are public safety, insurance, and rate issues.

Owner of Carmel Taxi, Ruth Ayala-Quezada stated currently, licenses are not being checked. She stated the safety and maintenance of the vehicles are also not being checked. She stated she works overnight and sees many intoxicated customers, especially at the Southeast Train Station. She stated there are many instances where people fall asleep on the train and miss their stop, and since Southeast is the end of the line, many taxis are there waiting to bring the passenger to where they were supposed to get off the train. She stated there are many vehicles waiting at the train station with plain "TAXI" signs in their window. She stated there are no regulations for these taxis.

Legislator Albano stated his daughter was involved in an accident with a taxi and he was surprised to find out that the driver did not have a license.

Ms. Quezada stated a New York taxi driver must have a New York Driver's License Class E. She stated many drivers have out of state licenses which are not being checked. She stated even if those taxis are pulled over, the police officer cannot determine if the license is a chauffeur's license.

Legislator Nacerino stated she is in favor of having a taxi and limousine commission. She stated her husband has a private car service. She stated this will protect against unscrupulous taxi services that are at the train stations that may not have proper licensing or maintenance. She stated her husband needed to register with the Westchester Taxi & Limousine Commission even though he owns and operates in Putnam County. She stated this is necessary because if the taxi is utilizing Westchester County roads, it must be registered within Westchester. She stated there must be some reciprocity because just as a taxi or limousine service is coming from Putnam County

and traveling through or to Westchester County, taxi or limousine services are also coming from other Counties and traveling into Putnam County. She stated this will bring more enforcement as well as revenue to Putnam County.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated to obtain the permit in Westchester is \$600.00.

Ms. Quezada stated the \$600.00 fee in Westchester is the base fee. She stated Carmel Taxi pays the base fee, which means the business is regulated. She stated this gives the business worker's compensation, the office and vehicles are checked, and an inspection of the businesses operation is done.

Chairwoman Addonizio questioned if it is displayed on the license plates in Westchester. She questioned how someone would know that the vehicle was regulated.

Ms. Quezada stated there are three (3) types of Westchester permits. She stated there are the Westchester plates, which cost \$300.00 for each vehicle, in addition to the \$600.00 base fee. She stated there is also a \$275.00 out of County permit, which allows the taxi to pick the customer up out of the County and drop off in Westchester. She stated there is also a \$100.00 medical waiver, which is for only Medicaid transportation. She stated in addition, each driver costs \$135.00 and a one (1) time investment of \$90.00 for fingerprinting and a background check.

Legislator LoBue stated it is important to standardize as it will weed out those non-legitimate businesses. She questioned if rates are regulated in Westchester. She stated some complaints she has heard locally are that customers have called for a taxi and gone a short distance and are charged a very high rate.

Ms. Quezada stated part of the "base" in Westchester County is that the business must submit their rates and their fees for service. She stated Carmel Taxi charges \$3.00 per mile from the base point. She stated the rate is charged from the base point to cover the miles it takes the driver to get to the customer. She provided an example of a customer who is calling from Cold Spring and would like to be taken to another destination in Cold Spring. She stated Carmel Taxi must leave their base in Carmel and drive to the customer in Cold Spring to take them to their destination. She stated even though that person may not have traveled far in the vehicle, the vehicle had to travel to get to them. She stated the cost is less for customers who are more local. She provided an example of picking up a customer on Seminary Hill Road in Carmel and taking them to Putnam Plaza in Carmel, which would cost about \$6.00. She stated if this same call went to a taxi company in Brewster, the charge would be higher because they are coming a farther distance to pick up the customer.

Legislator LoBue questioned if Carmel Taxi has their rates posted inside of the vehicles.

Ms. Quezada stated Carmel Taxi does not post their rates inside the vehicles.

Legislator LoBue questioned how long Ms. Quezada has owned her business.

Ms. Quezada stated she has been the business owner since 2006. She stated she has been in the business for 25 years.

Legislator Gouldman questioned if the Chamber of Commerce suggests a standardized rate system throughout the County.

Mr. Nulk stated that would be something to work on later on. He stated right now, permission must be obtained from the Towns and Villages so the County can request permission from the State. He stated once the permission is received, it can then be organized. He stated some Towns raised the question if they would be giving up the right to regulate their parking. He stated the regulations would be written once permission is obtained. He also stated zoning regulations would take care of the parking issues in each Town.

Ms. Quezada stated Westchester County regulates itself, however Mount Kisco has its own regulations, just as the Village of Brewster would.

Legislator Albano stated a letter should be sent to the Towns and Villages and if they grant the County permission, then further discussion should be had.

Legislator Nacerino stated she supports Legislator LoBue's suggestion that each Legislator should send a letter to each Town and Village requesting permission. She stated in the Town of Patterson, there is a fee and registration and she does not want double fees. She stated the fee should go to either the Town or the County, but not both.

Legislative Counsel Clem Van Ross clarified that the Legislature would be asking the State for permission to create a Taxi & Limousine Commission. He stated that Commission would then have power to do what local Commissions now do. He stated only a few Towns have this. He stated if an organization is to be formed in the County, the County Executive's input should be received. He stated the County Executive must give approval to the Legislature to request permission from State Representatives.

Mr. Nulk stated the Chamber of Commerce has had discussions with the Administration and they are in favor of getting this process started.

Legislator Castellano stated he brought this forward. He stated when this was reviewed in 2001, it was a Home Rule issue with the Towns and Villages. He stated he spoke to the Mayor of the Village of Brewster and he is in agreement that the County should regulate the taxis and limousines. He stated parking would still be regulated by the Towns. He stated this is a long process, but it does need to be done. He stated the illegitimate taxis that are waiting at the train stations are taking advantage of the passengers who get off of the train. He stated the Legislature must reach out to the Towns and the State Representatives.

Mr. Nulk stated Rockland County is in a four (4) year long process and they still do not have a Taxi & Limousine Commission.

Legislator Gouldman questioned how it works when taxis travel into other Counties.

Ms. Quezada stated Carmel Taxi has Westchester license plates, which entitles her to pick up customers from New York City and bring them into Westchester or Putnam. She stated is she not entitled to pick up a customer in New York City and bring them to a destination in New York City.

Legislator Gouldman stated many residents of the southwest region of the County use the Peekskill Train Station, which is in Westchester. He stated the residents getting off this train and into a taxi would be picked up in Westchester and brought into Putnam County.

Ms. Quezada stated Carmel Taxi is entitled to do that, but if a taxi company does not have a Westchester permit, they can be fined by the Westchester Taxi & Limousine Commission.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated when this all began, Westchester had the same problem with New York City, so they proposed that Putnam and Rockland join them in fighting New York City to get a Commission. He stated this was part of the Legislation that was passed and then vetoed. He stated before it was vetoed Westchester made a deal with New York City, therefore Rockland and Putnam were out of the picture.

Legislator Gouldman questioned if Uber would be involved in this at all.

Ms. Quezada stated Uber is not in Putnam County right now. She stated she is not aware how the Westchester Taxi & Limousine Commission is dealing with Uber. She stated there is no regulation with Uber, as a driver just has to enter their name and license and they can begin picking up customers. She stated as a passenger, they just have to enter their credit card.

Mr. Nulk stated Uber requires a more dense population.

Legislator Nacerino stated when the customer calls for an Uber, the driver's name and license information is shown.

Ms. Quezada stated the information is made available, but it is not being regulated.

Mr. Nulk requested that each Legislator send a letter to their respective Towns and Villages asking that a letter be sent back requesting the Legislature to obtain permission from the State to form a Taxi & Limousine Commission. He stated this is because the Home Rule of the local municipalities is being taken.

**Item #10 - Discussion/ Amendment/ Chapter 5 of the Putnam County Code
Entitled “Appropriations”/ Article I, Section 5-1 D (1) (2): Grant
Applications and Renewals**

Legislator Albano stated he would like to change this section of the Code. He stated currently, when a Department Head applies for a grant they are required to come to the Legislature for approval. He stated many times, the deadline for a grant application comes quickly. He stated it is important to remember that the Legislature has the right to accept or deny a grant. He stated he has faith in the Department Heads that they know when to apply for a grant. He stated he has yet to see that power be abused. He stated Department Heads know what they are looking for, and they should be able to apply for a grant that they feel is necessary. He stated the Legislature will then review the grant. He stated not having to get the Legislature’s approval to apply for a grant will save time. He stated a deadline could pass while waiting for approval and the County would have missed out on a grant opportunity. He reiterated that the Legislature has the final decision on whether to accept the grant or not.

Chairwoman Addonizio read an excerpt from the Putnam County Code: “In the case where time is of the essence and Legislative approval before submission is not possible, the Legislature shall be furnished the grant application for consideration by the next Full Legislative meeting.”

Legislator Albano stated the Department Head should apply regardless and not have to bring the application to the next Full Legislative Meeting. He stated when a grant application is brought in close to the deadline the question of “Why wasn’t this brought in sooner?” is frequently asked. He stated by applying for a grant, the Department Head is attempting to do something that would benefit Putnam County. He stated not having to obtain Legislative approval to apply for a grant would streamline the process.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated perhaps the Department Head could notify the Legislature that they are in the process of applying for a grant, more like an “FYI.”

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated the provision in the Code currently requires that any grant with a County match be approved. He stated it is written this way so that if the Legislature finds that the funds should not be committed to that grant, the process would not go forward from there. He stated with the change described by Legislator Albano, the grant would be applied for regardless and it would be reviewed by the Legislature if and when it is awarded to the County.

Legislator Albano stated he has not seen a grant application come before the Legislature that was not approved.

Legislator Nacerino stated she agrees with Legislator Albano and the Legislature should not micromanage, especially if time is of the essence. She stated as long as she has been on the Legislature, a Department Head has not been told they cannot apply for a grant. She stated the Legislature must review and accept or deny the grant award. She

stated a grant is not always the most cost effective route to take, and that is where the Legislature can step in.

Legislator Gouldman stated a grant application has not been denied as a body, but some Legislators individually have voted against it.

Legislator Albano stated he would rather look at the grant when it is a reality for the County rather than a possibility. He stated the Legislature can then make an intelligent decision on whether it is a good fit for Putnam County.

County Auditor Michele Sharkey stated if the grant has no County match it can be applied for without Legislative approval.

Legislator Albano stated he would like to eliminate Legislative approval to apply altogether.

Legislator Scuccimarra stated she agrees with Legislator Albano.

Legislative Counsel Van Ross stated an amendment should be drafted before it is voted on.

Legislator Castellano questioned clarification on the amendment being discussed. He clarified if there is no match in the grant, Legislative approval is not needed but if there is a match in the grant then Legislative approval is needed.

Legislator Albano stated the Legislature should be notified but not give permission for a department to apply.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated a notification letter should be sent to the Legislature when a Department is applying for a grant.

Item #11 - Discussion/ Late Agenda Items Surpassing Proper Committee and Going Straight to the Audit Committee (Tabled from August Rules Mtg.)

Legislator Castellano stated this is his third year as the Chairman of the Audit & Administration Committee. He stated this year, there have been more meetings scheduled shortly after the Full Meeting than in the past. He stated the first two (2) years he was here, there were no meetings scheduled the week of the Full Meeting. He stated some items were coming in later in the month and missing their proper Committee because the meeting was scheduled early in the month. He stated he has no objection to having items on the Audit Agenda as long as the information is received. He stated if there was an issue with an item the three (3) members of the Audit Committee could table it.

Chairwoman Addonizio stated the issue here is when items are surpassing their proper Committee and being addressed in the Audit Committee.

Legislator Albano stated most Legislators attend most of the meetings. He stated if a Legislator feels that an item is important, they should be present at the meeting where it will be discussed. He stated although it should go to the proper Committee, it is sometimes more effective if send it to the Audit Committee to move an item along.

Legislator Nacerino stated she is in agreement with not holding meetings the week of the Full Legislative Meeting.

Legislator Castellano stated having meetings three (3) nights in a row is difficult as well.

County Auditor Sharkey stated when she receives a fund transfer, she brings it to the Legislative Office and it is sent to the proper Committee as well as Audit. She stated sometimes there is a week between the last Committee Meeting and the Audit Meeting, therefore if she gets a fund transfer or budgetary amendment, it goes right to Audit.

Item #12 - Correspondence/ House of Representatives Bill #H.R. 1732/ Definition of "Waters of the United States"/ FYI – Duly Noted

Item #13 - Other Business - None

Item #14 - Adjournment

There being no further business at 8:46 P.M. Chairwoman Addonizio made a motion to adjourn; Seconded by Legislator Scuccimarra. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted by Administrative Assistant Beth Green.